

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 were pending in the application, claims 1-79 having been previously canceled, claims 80-82, 85-88, 91, and 93 having been previously withdrawn.

In the Office Action mailed August 17, 2009, claims 83-84 and 89-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 83-84 and 89-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 83, 89, and 92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Tso, et al., U.S. 6,185,625, (hereinafter, "*Tso*").

Claims 84 and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tso* in view of Mack, U.S. 6,192,044 (hereinafter *Mack*).

In response, applicants are hereby amending the claims for clarity and to obviate the §101 and §112 rejections. Support for the amendments is found, at least, in Paragraphs 0109-0111 of the application as published as US 2005/0102353. No new matter is being added.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 83-84 and 89-90 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The grounds for the rejection having been obviated by the instant amendment, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

C. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 83-84 and 89-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

The grounds for the rejection having been obviated by the instant amendment, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

D. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 83, 89, and 92 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Tso*.

Tso discloses techniques for data access over a communications link, where retrieving an object over a computer network is accomplished by a network client with a browser for rendering an object to a user and a user interface enabling the user to establish an encoding preference. A remote scaling server is coupled between the network client and the computer network, and includes a remote proxy and an encode service provider. The remote scaling server is configured to request a user-specified encoding preference from the network client, retrieve an object from the computer network using the remote proxy, encode the object using the encode service provider in accordance with the requested user-specified encoding preference, and transmit the encoded object to the network client using the remote proxy. *Tso*, abstract.

Tso fails to teach or suggest sending a request for a service reference to a lookup service, the request including an integer argument representing a desired maximum number of matches to said service reference that should be returned, and storing returned service references.

A finding that a claim is anticipated requires that “each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F. 2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Because *Tso* fails to disclose at least the features of the claims discussed above, claims 83, 89, and 92, and their respective dependent claims are patentable over *Tso*.

E. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 84 and 90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tso* and in view of *Mack*.

Serial No.: 10/669,692
Docket No.: 30014200-1206
Amendment "C" dated November 17, 2009
Reply to the Office Action mailed August 17, 2009

The Office Action asserted that *Mack* discloses establishing a network phone call connection between a caller and a callee that employs a look-up service and a callee connection service. Whether or not this is true, such disclosure fails to cure the deficiencies noted above.

As a result, claims 84 and 90 are patentable over the combination of *Tso* and *Mack*.

F. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 83, 84, 89, 90, and 92 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By / *Michael L. Dayl* /
Michael L. Day, Reg. No. 55101
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
415-882-5064 (telephone)
415-882-0300 (facsimile)
ATTORNEYS UNDER RULE 34